



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

those very prophecies and Churches, and by maintaining the powers of his predecessors, both to recall the letters of peace already sent, and to cease from his proposed reception of the (charismata). Thus Præxes effected two works of the devil at Rome; he expelled the prophecy and brought in heresy; he put to flight the Paraclete and crucified the Father."

How this shows "that the communion and the supreme influence of the Pope was then owned and felt by the Asiatic Churches" is to us incomprehensible. It seems to prove nothing but that the Bishop of Rome (whoever he was at that day) was a very weak man, wavering about between the heresies of the Patripassians on the one side and the Montanists on the other. That the supreme influence of the Pope was not owned by all the Asiatic Churches in the time of Pope Victor will be abundantly evident from the next number, vii.

VII. Dr. Geraghty here has reversed the order of events. In the pontificate of Victor the dispute with the Churches of Asia, about the time of keeping Easter, was renewed. The Churches of Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia still differed from the rest of Christendom, as they had done in the time of Anicetus, in keeping Easter (as the Jews had held their passover) on the 14th day of March, without regard to the day of the week, while the rest of the Churches always kept it on Sunday, the day of our Lord's resurrection. Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, and other Asian Bishops, summoned councils, at the instance, not by the command,<sup>9</sup> of Victor, who had formed the idea of bringing about an uniform practice; but so far from acquiescing in his views, these councils unanimously resolved that their own practice, for which they had the sanction of Polycarp, the deacon Philip, and St. John, should be maintained. Victor, having the greatest part of the Christian world on his side, attempted the bold and then somewhat rash expedient of endeavouring to cut off the Asiatics from communion with his Church, but was foiled in the attempt; for the Catholic Church was so far from supporting Pope Victor in his anathemas, that even those who agreed with him in the desire to bring about uniformity of practice refused to unite with him in excommunicating their brethren, and rebuked him sharply; and Irenæus particularly, though with his accustomed mildness, pressed upon him the difference between the spirit in which he acted and that of his predecessor, Anicetus, when disputing with Polycarp on the same matter.<sup>10</sup> So entirely abortive, indeed, was Victor's attempt, that about 60 years after, Firmilian, in his letter to Cyprian, expressly asserted that the peace and unity of the Catholic Church had never been broken by differences about the observance of Easter or other religious rites; and that, be it remembered, while alluding to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, who had quarrelled with Cyprian because his custom differed from the Romans on the rebaptizing of heretics.<sup>11</sup>

Here, then, we have the most satisfactory evidence that the Catholic Church, so near the Apostles' times as the end of the second century, decided AGAINST the power of the Bishop of Rome to cut off whom he might think fit from the common unity, and would not support him in it: which makes the case infinitely stronger; for it was not merely that they knew nothing of such a claim, but that it was practically made and decided against. The question as to the time of keeping Easter, in fact, remained unsettled until the Council of Nice, which decided against the Asiatic custom, on the ground that St. John intended the observance to be temporary, and only in countries bordering on the Jews.

VIII. We never denied that Rome was considered in the times of St. Cyprian the "principal" Church, as is fully admitted in our article on the precedence of Rome in our last March number (supra, p. 28). That it was also called by St. Cyprian the "chair of Peter," in a certain sense, may be safely conceded (though we strongly suspect the words relied on here to be interpolated); but that Cyprian could have meant that the unity of the episcopate had its origin from Rome is incredible, as being not only false in historical fact, but abhorrent to

<sup>9</sup> Tertullian *adversus Præxeum*, p. 634.—"Iste (Præxes) primus ex Asia hoc genus perversitatis, inuit Romæ; homo et alias inquietus . . . . dilectionem Del non habens, cuius charismata quoque expugnavit. Nam idem (Præxes) tunc Episcopum Romanum, agnoscens jam prophetias Montani, Priscæ, Maximillæ, et ex ea agnitione pacem Ecclesiæ et Phrygia inferentem, falsa de ipsa Propheta et Ecclesiæ coram adseverando, et præcessorum ejus auctoritates defendendo, cœgit et literas pacis revocare jam emissas, et a proposito recipiendorum charismatum concessare. Ita duo negotia diaboli Præxes Romæ procuravit, prophetiam expulit, et hæresim inuit; Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit."

<sup>10</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. lib. v. c. 24*, p. 156.—"I could also mention," says Polycrates, "the Bishops that were present whom you requested to be summoned by me, and whom I did call." "Possem etiam episcoporum quæcumque sunt, facere mentionem, quos petistis ut convocaremus (οἱ ὑπεισῆσθαι μετακληθῆναι ἡμῖν) sicut et feci."—Valesius ed. Amstelod. 1695.

<sup>11</sup> See the extract from Dupin's *Eccles. Hist.* in our April number, p. 46, supra.

<sup>12</sup> "Eos autem qui Romæ sunt non ea in omnibus observare quisint ab origine tradita et frustra apostolorum auctoritatem pretendere scire quis etiam inde potest quod circa celebrandos dies Pascha et circa multa alla divina rei sacramenta videat esse apud illos aliquas diversitatibus, nec observari illuc omnia aequaliter quae Hierosolymis observantur, secundum quod in ceteris quoque plurimis provinciis multa pro locorum et nominum diversitate variantur, nec tamem proper hoc ad ecclesiæ Catholicae pace agere unilate aliquando discessum est. Quod nunc Stephanus anus est facere, rumpens adversus vos pacem, quam semper antecessores ejus vobiscum amore et honori mutuo custoderunt."—Cyprian, *Epi. 75*; Ben. Ed., Venet. 1758; p. 244.

common sense; for this would be to make that unity flow from Rome to Antioch, even while Peter was Bishop of that latter See (if he ever acted as Bishop anywhere), and before he even saw Rome; and would even make Jerusalem herself receive that unity in the first instance from Rome (for it is not *exortitur* or *progreditur*, as Dr. G.'s translation would imply, but *exorta est*), as if there was not a sacerdotal unity of the Church at Jerusalem before Rome was ever evangelized. The expression is evidently at best somewhat lax; but we must interpret it so as to be in accordance with the writer's known opinions and with common sense. Perhaps he meant that the unity of the episcopate flowed from Rome to Carthage, whence, and concerning the affairs and outraged Church-unity of which, he was writing; and this would be true enough, for *Africa Propria*, in which Carthage lay, doubtless received its orders from Rome. We shall see, moreover, when we come to deal with St. Cyprian more at large (as we purpose doing in our next number), that in this very epistle to Cornelius (No. 55, Ben. Ed.) he denies the right of appeal to Rome, expostulates with Cornelius for wavering at the threats of the agents of Fortunatus, the schismatical Bishop of Carthage, and asserts the rights of Bishops in language quite incompatible with the idea of Cornelius being his ecclesiastical superior, much less the infallible supreme head of the Church.

X. It is not true that either Fortunatus or Felicissimus (whom Dr. G. calls *Felix*) were Bishops. They were mere impostors schismatically claiming the title, and their pretended appeal to Rome was a mere attempt, as St. Cyprian indignantly proves, to delude Cornelius into the belief that Fortunatus was really Bishop of Carthage, instead of Cyprian. We shall see hereafter, when we come to treat of St. Cyprian more at large, that he wholly denies the right of appeal to Rome in his 55th epistle, which contains an indignant expostulation with Cornelius for having been weak enough, under intimidation, to listen to the accusations of the schismatical Felicissimus, then acting as agent for Fortunatus at Rome.

XI. Who Dr. G. means by the Oriental Patriarch here we cannot divine; but we know that what he says is a complete misrepresentation of Athanasius's statement on the subject. Dionysius of Alexandria had written so strongly against the Sabellians that those who then held the doctrines afterwards professed by Arius pretended that Dionysius was in favour of them. What Athanasius says on the matter is verbatim as follows, which shows that the defence of Dionysius of Alexandria was a *voluntary* proceeding to clear his theological character, not a judicial trial before the Pope. St. Athanasius does not say that his *acquittal* by the Pope was a proof of his innocence, or anything equivalent to it—  
"When some of the brethren, not knowing the cause of his (Dionysius's) writings, went to Rome, they complained of him to his name-sake, the Roman Bishop. Which having heard, he (Dionysius of Alexandria) wrote both against the followers of Sabellius and against those also who held the opinions which Arius, having subsequently professed, was cast out of the Church for. He also sent letters to Dionysius, to desire that he would inform him of what he had been accused by these persons. But he without delay wrote books which he entitled *Elenchus and Apologia*, to expurgate himself. Here I pray you to remark the execrable workshop of the enemies of Christ, and by what a compact they move to their own ignominy; for since Dionysius, the Bishop of Rome, also wrote against those who say that the Son of God was a creature, it clearly appears that not now for the first time, but formerly also, the heresy of the Arians, the enemies of Christ, was condemned by anathema. Since then, Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, expurgated himself concerning his epistle, it is manifest that he neither was of the opinion which they ascribed to him, nor was he imbued at all with the wicked doctrine of Arius."<sup>12</sup>

XII. We scarcely think that Dr. G. can have ever read the passage in Socrates which he refers to; for Socrates does not purport to give the *order* of subscriptions, but merely to state the names of those who were present; and it is remarkable that he does not name the legates of Sylvester first, but Osius, Bishop of Cordova in Spain, who, we find from Labbe and Cossart, tom. ii., p. 50, actually subscribed the canons of Nice before Victor and Vincentius, the deputies of Sylvester. What, then, becomes of Dr. G.'s argument that Sylvester's legates subscribed before the Oriental Patriarchs?

XIII. It is true that the passage Dr. Geraghty quotes is in the history of Socrates as we have it now. After all we have proved of forgeries and interpolations, we cannot be expected to swallow everything without examination, as if it must needs be his whose name it bears. No books were more exposed to interpolation than these short abstracts and chronicles of history. We have no doubt that the sentence in question is a marginal note, made by some one who disagreed with Socrates, and

<sup>13</sup> Deinde cum Dionysius Alexandrinus episcopus de epistola sua sece purgaret, palam est illum, nec ejus fuisse sententiam quam ei adscribunt, neque omnino prava Arii doctrina imbutum fuisse.—S. Athan., *Oper. Ben. Ed. Paris, 1698; tom. i. p. 252; No. 13.*

afterwards copied into the text by some transcriber. There is an evident want of connection in the construction of the sentence. There was no such canon then invented; and if there had been, Socrates would not have supported it. Socrates was a *lawyer* at Constantinople. He held the 3rd canon of the general council of Constantinople (Lib. v. c. 8). The Pope pronounced that canon invalid. Socrates held that canon to be a valid decree of a general council, notwithstanding the opposition of the Pope. As a lawyer at Constantinople, Socrates must have held the decree of the Emperor, which confirmed that canon. It is impossible, therefore, that Socrates could have held that no canon of the Church could be made without the consent of the Pope.

The real opinion of Socrates about the Pope is sufficiently shown where he speaks of the Novatians (Lib. vii. c. xi.). He praises the toleration extended to them at Constantinople, and condemns the persecution of them at Rome, saying that "the episcopacy of Rome, as well as that of Alexandria, going beyond the priesthood, had long since arrived at tyranny."<sup>14</sup>

The passage in question, therefore, could not have been written by Socrates, but is a note or interpolation by some other, and never was a more unlucky occasion for such a note. It is true that the canons of Antioch to which the interpolated passage applies were made without the Pope's consent. Pope Innocent I. rejected those canons, not as being made without his authority, but on a charge of Arianism against those who made them. Nevertheless, those canons of Antioch were adopted into the code of the universal Church, and acknowledged and received by the general council of Chalcedon. Those same canons were afterwards put into the Roman code by Dionysius Exiguus, and perpetuated there by Gratian; nor have any canons of discipline ever had greater influence in Christendom—Greek, Roman, and Protestant.

#### THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I am very much puzzled to know what my Roman Catholic neighbours think about their mass, and, perhaps, as you are learned in their controversy, you could tell me. From what I have read in books, I am led to understand that they believe that in the mass is offered up to God a sacrifice of infinite value, namely, the very same sacrifice that was offered up on Calvary, the sacrifice of the body and blood of the Blessed Son of God. But I cannot make this square at all with what I see and hear of going on about me. A Roman Catholic farmer, a neighbour of mine, gave the priest thirty shillings to have a dozen masses said for his mother's soul—that is, half-a-crown a mass. Is that mass, sir, the same thing as they believe to be the body and blood of the Lord. Sure, sir, the priests would not do over again what Judas did, and sell Him for thirty pieces of silver. And I can't conceive for the life of me how a thing can be of infinite value if you can buy it for half-a-crown. I have heard, too, of another man who paid for a mass being said when the distemper got among his cattle, and of another man who had a mass said for the success of the fishing. Sir, I don't like to repeat again what I read they take the mass to be; but if they thought it was *that*, would they offer it up for a sick cow, or for a take of herrings?

A little information on this subject would much oblige

#### A PLAIN PROTESTANT.

[We have not space here to give a full answer to our correspondent's question, but in our next number we hope to give him an account of the manner in which Roman Catholic divines explain the difficulties which he feels. Whether our correspondent will find these explanations satisfactory or not is more than we can tell.]

#### THE GLORIES OF MARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR.—The Reader opened the Douay Bible the other night, and says he, "What did St. Paul mean when he said to the gaoler at Philippi, 'Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved'?" "He meant," says Andy, "that if a man puts his trust in Christ, and looks to him for salvation, his sins will be forgiven, and he'll go to heaven." "Very good," says the Reader. "And now tell me what does St. Peter mean when he says, respecting Christ, 'Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved'?" "He means," says Andy, "that no one else can save us but Jesus Christ." "Why, then," says old Murty, "is it turning souper you are? Sure that's always the cry of them Protestants; but we know better than that. Sure it's the blessed mother of God, the holy Virgin, that saves us from our sins. All good Catholics have salvation through her, and there's no salvation without her." "Hold your tongue," says Andy, "and don't be disgracing us before the Protestants by your ignorance." "It's yourself that's disgracing us," says he, "by denying that the Virgin is the saviour of sinners; but," says he, "you and the Protestants may look to who you like for salvation, but we'll look to Mary: leave us the mother and you may have the Son." "Don't mind what that fellow says," says Andy; "sure he don't know the doctrines of our Church at all." "That's partly

<sup>14</sup> Episcopatus Romanus perinde atque Alexandrinus, ultra sacerdotii fines progressus, jam olim in dominacionem degenerasset.

<sup>a</sup> Acts xvi. 31. <sup>b</sup> Acts iv. 12. <sup>c</sup> A common expression.

true," says the Reader. "He's not as learned as you in canons and decrees of councils, but he knows full well what's believed and practised by the great bulk of the people, and I wouldn't desire a better sample of the thoughts and feelings of nine-tenths of our Roman Catholic neighbours than Murty. The truth is," says the Reader, "that educated Roman Catholics confess, at least by their words, that salvation is to be obtained through Christ, though, perhaps, dispensed by the Virgin Mary; but educated Romanists, who form the bulk of our people, make no distinction of that kind, but put their whole hope and trust in the Virgin; they confess it honestly, for they're not ashamed of it, as they believe it to be quite right." "But," says Andy, "it's their own ignorance makes them do so, and how can we help that?" "I deny that," says the Reader. "It's not ignorance, in a general point of view, that makes them believe it; but ignorance of God's word, and the instruction which they get from the Church." "That's false," says Andy, "it's out of their own heads they pick up these ideas; for our Church points the sinner to Christ, and to no one else." "Well," says the Reader, "I'll meet you on that ground, and if your Church (as you say) directs the sinner to Christ and none else, I'll forgive her all her other errors. I believe that many faults in a system of religion may be forgiven, if it points to Christ as the only Saviour, and tells its people that there is salvation in Him and no salvation without Him. Now," says he, "I'll let you off for the present about purgatory, and transubstantiation, and infallibility, and supremacy, and all the other unscriptural doctrines which your Church has introduced, and I'll put you on your trial on this single point—Does the Church of Rome direct the sinner to Christ, or does she not?" "I'm satisfied," says Andy; "so go on with your argument." "Well," says the Reader, "I undertake to prove that your Church tells the poor sinner that Christ is a hard, cruel being, who will not hear him or pardon him; that he has no chance of mercy if he goes to Him; but that if he goes to the Virgin she will receive and pardon him." "Show us your proofs," says Andy. "Well," says the Reader, "I might prove it by just asking any of our humble Roman Catholic neighbours what they trusted to in the hour of death, and they'd tell you that 'twas to the blessed mother of God.<sup>a</sup> I might prove it by showing you some of the pictures sold at every fair and market, which represent the Virgin as the person who takes the sinner into heaven and snatches him out of hell. I might prove it by the words Murty used just now, and which has almost passed into a proverb amongst the people, 'Give us the mother and you may have the Son.' I might prove it by the scapulars of the Virgin, which you put on your friends when about to die, and which your own books tell you will save them from Purgatory. I might prove it from your prayers and rosaries, your Confessors and Hail Marys, and from the plain, honest confession of nine-tenths of your people; but as these are not proofs which Protestants in general could come at, I think it better to prove my point out of books which contain the authorised teaching of your Church, and then everyone can see whether I'm telling truth or not." "But," says Andy, "there's many a book printed by our clergy that I won't allow as evidence at all. I'll admit of nothing but what has the sanction of my Church." "I expected that," says the Reader; "it's a good way of getting out of a difficulty to shake off the poor writer that caused it. But," says he, "the book that I'll bring forward is one that you won't be able to shake off in that way." "Produce your book," says Andy. "Here it is," says the Reader. "It has been lately circulated very widely amongst us by the Redemptorist fathers who came preaching through the country. You all know it well; it's the Glories of Mary, by St. Alphonsus Liguori."<sup>b</sup> "How do you prove the authority of that book," says Andy. "It has the sanction of your Church," says the Reader. "Just listen to what is said in the preface: 'Remember that it (the book) has been strictly examined by the authority which is charged by God Himself to instruct you, and that authority has declared that it contains NOTHING worthy of censure.'" "But," says Andy, "that's an Italian book, and what call have we to it?" "It's the English translation of it," says the Reader, "that the priests give out, as you well know; and just look here in the first page, and you'll see Cardinal Wiseman's hat and coat of arms, and under them these words: 'We hereby approve of this translation of the Glories of Mary, and cordially recommend it to the faithful.—N., Cardinal WISEMAN, Archbishop of Westminster.' Now," says the Reader, "if that book isn't of authority I don't know what is, it was written by one of your greatest saints, it was examined by your Church and pronounced faultless, and it is highly recommended by the head of your Church in this country." "Well," says Andy, "I allow the authority of that book, and anything contained in it must be the true teaching of our Church." "Well, then," says the Reader, "turn to page 18, and we'll see whether the sinner is pointed to Christ or from Him. We read thus: 'The Kingdom of God, consisting in justice and mercy, was divided by our Lord. The kingdom of justice He reserved for Himself, and that of mercy He yielded to Mary; ordaining

that all mercies that are dispensed to men should pass through the hands of Mary, and be disposed of by her at will'; and at page 14, we read thus: 'The eternal Father gave the office of judge and avenger to the Son, and that of showing mercy and relieving the necessities to the mother.'"<sup>c</sup> "Sure," says Murty, "isn't that just what I said a minute ago when Andy was down on me for it; sure it's true what that book says: we'll only get vengeance from Christ, but we'll get mercy from Mary." "Now," says the Reader, "isn't that the natural consequence of such teaching; it's no wonder that Roman Catholics should fear the Saviour and love the Virgin, when the one is represented as a stern judge; the other as a merciful deliverer. Now look to page 85, where a celebrated saint is represented as speaking thus: 'If my Redeemer rejects me on account of my sins, and drives me from His sacred feet, I will cast myself at those of His beloved mother Mary, and will there remain prostrate until she has obtained my forgiveness.' No wonder that with such teaching as this the poor sinner is turned away from Christ; he is taught that he will find no mercy from Him, but that Mary is all-merciful." "Well, surely," says Jerry, "it's a queer thing to tell us that Christ is hard and unmerciful, when we read of His being so kind and pitiful to all who come to Him. 'Twas He that said, 'Come to me all you that labour and are burdened, and I will refresh you,'<sup>d</sup> and is it likely that He'd drive away the poor sinner when he came to obey His own command? and 'twas that same Saviour that said, 'Him that cometh to me I will not cast out';<sup>e</sup> and still that book tells us that we've no chance at all if we go to Him; and wasn't it Christ that said, 'I am not come to call the just, but sinners';<sup>f</sup> and still that book tells us, that because we're sinners He'll drive us from His sacred feet. Now," says he, "which are we to believe Christ or the book; for both can't be true?" "Stop a while," says the Reader, "till you hear a little more of it. At page 68 we have a prayer to the Virgin, and in it are these words: 'If Thou protectest me, what can I fear? I fear nothing. I do not fear my sins; for Thou canst provide a remedy. I do not fear devils, for Thou art more powerful than the whole of hell. I do not even fear thy Son, though justly irritated against me; for at a word of thine He will be appeased.'"<sup>g</sup> "Well, surely," says Jerry, "that book and the Bible are greatly opposed to one another: the Bible tells us that it's Christ provides the remedy for sins; but that book tells us that it's the Virgin does it." "Look at page 292," says the Reader, "and you'll find these words: 'Through thee we have been reconciled to our God: thou art the only advocate of sinners.'"<sup>h</sup> "Well," says Jerry, "that beats all I ever heard. Doesn't St. Paul tell us that God 'hath' reconciled us to Himself by Christ;<sup>i</sup> and doesn't St. John tell us that 'if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just,'<sup>j</sup> and in spite of all that are we to believe that the Virgin is the only advocate for sinners?" "Listen again," says the Reader. "At page 287 we find this prayer: 'Oh, Lady, change us from sinners into saints; work this miracle, which will redound more to thy honour than if thou didst restore sight to a thousand blind persons, or didst raise a thousand from the dead.'"<sup>k</sup> "Well," says Jerry, "I always thought that it was God changed the heart, and that nothing but the power of Omnipotence could do it." "Very true," says the Reader; "but then, this book tells us that Mary is omnipotent." "Oh, go easy," says Andy, "sure all the world knows that the word Omnipotent can only be applied to God." "Well," says the Reader, "take the book yourself, and read out what I marked with pencil at page 285." So he read these words—"O Mary, thou art omnipotent to save sinners." "Now turn to page 239," says the Reader. So he read out these words—"He who is powerful hath made thee omnipotent in heaven and on earth." "Now," says the Reader, "wasn't it the truth I told you?" "Twas so," says Jerry; "but I think 'tis enough to make one's hair stand on end to hear such blasphemy." "No," says Murty, "but 'tis the finest reading at all to be listening to. Sure it proves that our souls are safe so long as we put our trust in the blessed mother of God. So you may all do as you like; but it's myself that will stick to her rather than to Christ or any one else. Sure," says he, "don't you remember the story Father John told us in his sermon 'about the people trying to get to heaven by Christ's ladder, and all being thrown down again; but those who came to Mary's ladder got safe up.'"<sup>l</sup> "Yes," says the Reader, "and that very story is in this book. Look to page 200, and we read that in vision brother Leo saw a red ladder, at the summit of which was Jesus Christ, and a white one, on the top of which was the Virgin, and he saw some trying to get up to heaven by the red ladder, but when they got up a few steps they fell, and they tried again, and again fell; they were then advised to go and try the white ladder, and by that they easily ascended, for the Virgin stretched out her hand and helped them, and so they got safely to heaven." "That's the very thing Father John told us," says Murty, "and do you think we'd be such fools as to go to Christ while we have the blessed mother of God to go to?" "Well," says Andy,

"that book goes too far, I think; and I, for one, don't hold all that it says." "But," says the Reader, "I put it to you now in the sight of God: aren't there thousands of your poor ignorant people who do believe it, who put their whole hope and trust in the Virgin, and who look on Christ as one to be feared, but not at all to be loved?" "Well," says Andy, "I can't deny that the common people believe it; but scholars and learned people like myself don't hold it." "And," says the Reader, "isn't it a fearful thing that those people are led astray, and their precious souls destroyed, by such teaching as this? And isn't the poor man's soul as valuable to him as the rich man's soul is to him? and isn't it awful to see poor creatures led astray by the very persons who should lead them right? I could fill the CATHOLIC LAYMAN," says he, "with passages out of this book, telling the poor sinner that Christ would only punish him, but that Mary would pardon him; that Christ will only inflict vengeance on them, but that Mary will 'hold back the avenging arm of her son' (93); that Christ, irritated by our sins, will abandon us to the power of the devil (230), but that Mary will deliver us from hell (241). Nay, more, that she would even obtain pardon for Satan, if he only humbled himself so far as to seek her aid (95). Now," says he, "after all that, have you the face to tell me that your Church directs the sinner to Christ as the only Saviour?" "Isn't it a shame for you," says Andy, "to be abusing the Blessed Virgin, that, at all events, was the mother of Christ. Don't listen to him any longer," says he; "for it's only blasphemy he's speaking." "Stop a minute, boys," says the Reader; "that's a very old dodge Andy is on now, representing us as abusing the Virgin, when we're only standing up for Christ; but," says he, "bear this in mind, that no Protestant would abuse the Virgin Mary. We respect and honour her, and believe her to be a blessed saint in heaven; we read her hymn of praise every Sunday in our Churches, and would be sorry to say one word against her who was honoured as no other woman was before or since; so don't try to raise that cry against us, for 'twon't do; but," says he, "you may be just to one without being unjust to another, and you may allow the Virgin all the honour that she deserves without belying our blessed Lord, and representing Him as hard and cruel, when He is, in truth, gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness. Speak the truth," says he, "and that's all we ask of you. Did the Virgin come down from the right hand of God to suffer for sinners? Did the crown of thorns pierce her brow? Did she shed great drops of blood in dark Gethsemane? Did she hang upon the cross at Calvary? Did she pay the great debt for sinners and make atonement for sin? No! 'twas Christ that did it; 'twas He that traversed this cold world, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; 'twas He that was mocked, and buffeted, and spit upon; 'twas He that was nailed to the accursed tree; 'twas He that uttered the bitter cry, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' 'twas He that lived, and suffered, and bled, and died for man's salvation. And isn't it a sin and a shame, and black ingratitude, to represent that Saviour as hard and cruel, and unmerciful, when He proved His love and His mercy, and His goodness, by laying down His life for us?" "Well, surely," says Jerry, "it must grieve the blessed Saviour to have the people set against Him in that way, and He after doing so much for us. Sure," says he, "there's nothing would grieve me so much as if the children that I work for, and slave for, and love better than myself, were to turn against me without cause, and give all their love to one who never did for them what I have done; and, in like manner, mustn't it be a great grief to the merciful Redeemer to see the people that He loved better than His own heart's blood, whom He wept for, and prayed for, and suffered for, and died for; to see them turning from Him as their enemy; to see them fearing Him, instead of loving Him; and to see them giving all their love to one who never did for them what the Saviour did and suffered." "True for you," says the Reader. "I suppose the history of the world couldn't show such black ingratitude as that, and surely they'll have a heavy account to render who turn the poor perishing sinner from a merciful Saviour, by telling him that because of his sins he will drive Him from His feet (85). Oh!" says he, "won't many a lost soul put his heavy curse upon the man who turned him away from the Redeemer, who would have saved him. 'Twas an awful thing in the old times when the people lighted false signal fires on the cliffs, and the poor sailors, unconscious of danger, steered boldly on, thinking they were drawing near the desired haven, and it was not until the vessel struck upon the rock, and her stout frame was shivered, and her strong planks scattered on the waves, that her wretched crew saw that they had been lured to their ruin, and then arose the loud shriek of agony, and the wild yell of despair, and the long wailing cry of drowning men; and the wave passed over them, and they were gone. And thus it is with the priests of the Church of Rome, who lure the poor sinner to his ruin, by directing him to Mary, instead of Christ. God forgive them; for, surely, they've a heavy account to render. But, boys," says he, "if you love your precious souls; if you would gain heaven and avoid hell, put your trust in none but Christ; for there is none other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved."

Your humble servant,  
DAN CARTHY.

<sup>a</sup> See the Hall Mary.

<sup>b</sup> London: Printed for the Redemptorist Fathers, St. Mary's, Clapham, Surrey. <sup>c</sup> The large print is in the original.

<sup>d</sup> Matt. xi. 28. <sup>e</sup> John vi. 37. <sup>f</sup> Matt. ix. 13. <sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. v. 18. <sup>h</sup> 1. John ii. 1.